



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

42

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/305,892	05/05/99	DALLMIER	A 5244-D1

IM22/0215

ROBERT A MILLER  
PATENT & LICENSING DEPARTMENT  
NALCO CHEMICAL COMPANY  
ONE NALCO CENTER  
NAPERVILLE IL 60563-1198

EXAMINER

MORRISON, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

5

DATE MAILED:

02/15/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/305,892

Applicant(s)  
Dallmier et al.

Examiner  
Betsey Morrison

Group Art Unit  
1724



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 28, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1724

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claims 1-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 5,795,487. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,795,487. This is a double patenting rejection.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1724

5. Claims 20-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 13, 20 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 5,795,487 in view of Goodenough et al. (column 1, line 64-column 2, line 51).

The claims differ from claims 1, 13, 20 and/or 21 of U.S. Patent No. 5,795,487 by reciting adding a specific stabilizer to the unstabilized solution of alkali or alkaline earth metal hypobromite (claims 20 and 22-27).

Goodenough et al. disclose a process for producing bromide solutions for use as disinfectants comprising adding stabilizers to the solutions, which include the stabilizers of the instant claims. The advantage of adding stabilizers to the bromine solutions is that the solutions are more resistant to degradation than bromine solutions that do not include stabilizers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the present invention was made, to have included the addition of stabilizers in the methods of claims 1, 13, 20 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 5,795,487, in order that the solutions become more resistant to degradation.

6. Claims 22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite the limitation "the aqueous solution of an alkali metal sulfamate", but there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betsey Morrison whose telephone number is (703) 305-3934. The examiner

Art Unit: 1724

can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM, and on alternate Fridays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. David Simmons, can be reached at (703) 308-1972. The fax phone number for official after final faxes for this Group is (703)305-3599, for all other official faxes the number is (703)305-7718, and for unofficial faxes the number is (703) 305-3602.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



David A. Simmons  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700



B. Morrison  
February 13, 2000